

Minutes for the Legislative Branch Computer System Planning Council Meeting held on September 14, 2000.

Please Note: These are summary minutes. Testimony and discussion are paraphrased and condensed.

COUNCIL MEMBERS PRESENT

Bob Person, Executive Director, Legislative Services Division, ex officio chairman
Clayton Schenck, Legislative Fiscal Analyst
Rosana Skelton, Secretary of the Senate
Representative Mark E. Noennig
Brett Boutin, ISD

COUNCIL MEMBERS ABSENT

Chuckie Cramer, Senate Sargent At Arms
Scott Seacat, Legislative Auditor
Marilyn Miller, Chief Clerk of the House

OTHER STAFF PRESENT

Legislative Services Division

Lois Menzies
Karen Berger
Hank Trenk
Jeanette Nordahl
Steve Eller

Legislative Fiscal Division

Terry Johnson
Greg DeWitt

Bob Person called the meeting to order at 1:35 P.M.

Bob asked Greg Dewitt if he would report on the activities of IT Management Subcommittee. Greg reported that the subcommittee had one meeting since the last Computer System Planning Council meeting. At that meeting the Subcommittee finalized all of its recommendations for its final report. Greg provided a draft copy summarizing the final report. (See attached)

The Council then moved on to item 2 on the agenda: FY 02/03 Branch Computer System Plan. Bob walked the council through the proposed plan. Lois Menzies asked why the plan did not include current IT FTE. Terry Johnson explained that although IT staff was pretty much

centralized within LSD, both LFD and LAD had staff that did IT functions part time. Terry thought it would take some work to figure out what percentage of this staff's time was spent on IT. Since it was almost too late to get this information together this time, the Council directed staff to put the IT FTE budget in the FY 04/05 Branch Computer System Plan.

The Council discussed the FTE vs Contracted Services issue. Hank explained that all additional personnel resources in the budget were budgeted as contracted services. He said that there were places in the budget where contracted services worked well and places where FTE worked well. Contracted services works well for temporary help such as for session or for help with projects where the current staff did not have the skills or expertise needed. FTE works well where there is a need for a full time person and where it has been proved that the State can hire and retain that skill level. Hank went on to say that the only spot in the current budget that FTE would work well was for the two Network Support Specialists. These two positions have been in existence as contracted services for about the last 2 to 3 years. Bob indicated that during the legislative budget process, it was easier to get contracted service through than to get an FTE through. He also said that a possible approach was to keep the contracted services in the budget and after the session was over to ask the Legislative Council (LSD's approving authority) to convert it to contracted services where appropriate. The Council agreed to move forward with this approach.

The Council then discussed the Contingency Fund. Hank said that this was an issue that Scott Seacat brought up at the last meeting. He proposed that the IT budget include some funding for unanticipated requirements that come up, especially with regard to SABHRS and BANNERS. The proposed budget includes \$50,000 each FY for this Fund. The Council felt that this fund should be used for any unanticipated requirements that come up, not just as they relate to SABHRS, BANNERS and other administrative systems. The Council instructed staff to make adjustments to the wording in the plan to accommodate this.

The Council moved on to discuss the Legislator Automation Options. The first item discussed was whether to lease or purchase the laptops. Ideally the legislature only needs to use them for the duration of session. Hank said that they had done a little work into finding out if a 6 month lease was possible. He said that the two main vendors on the state term contract that they purchase laptops from (IBM and Dell) both only offer a 24 month lease. He said that they also checked into other local PC vendors and found one the might do a 6 month lease. However, to purchase from that vendor would require the state to go through the bid process. The council then explored the possibility of letting the legislators keep the laptop all year round. Hank said that that would drive up the support cost because each of the laptops would have to be supported remotely. The Council decided that since the budget and plan for the 2003 session was to only implement Legislator Automation as a pilot with a limited number of laptops that this was not that important an issue. The Branch would just purchase the laptops for the 2003 session pilot and continue to work on this issue down the road.

The Council then discussed the issue of allowing the legislators to bring their own laptops. This issue was brought up by the Legislative Council when the Legislator Automation proposal was first brought to them. They wondered if the price could be brought down any with this approach. Hank said that he belonged to a listserv which connected him via e-mail to all the other IT

managers in the 50 state legislatures. He said that this question has come up a couple of time on the listserv and that the overwhelming response is to not do this. He said that the main reason was because it was difficult to support. Any saving might be taken up in support costs. Hank also said that it would be difficult to effectively implement chamber automation if you had a bunch of different laptops, because you could not be sure that chamber automation software would run properly on such a variety of machines. The council agreed that the state purchase or lease of laptops was the best approach.

The Council then went on to discuss Chamber Automation. Hank said that he had done some investigation into exactly what Chamber Automation was. He said that it mainly consisted of the ability to bring up the text of bills and amendments on each laptop in the chambers when that bill or amendment was up for consideration. He also said that it consisted of an integrated system where you could look at all of the legislative data linked together. Hank said that the integrated system part of Chamber Automation was already being done with the current LAWS system and that the only part of the system that was need was to automatically bring up the text of bills/amendments. He said that he contacted the current Vote/Agenda display system vendor (Daktronics) and got a quote from them on providing the trigger software to bring up the Bills/Amendments. He then added about 4 months worth of contracted services to that quote to fine tune the system.

The Council then discussed the wireless technology part of Legislator Automation. Hank said that this technology would allow the legislator to roam around the capitol building with their laptop and remain connected to the network. Hank said that this technology was beginning to mature but was still very new. He said that it was a good idea to move forward cautiously, and with that in mind, he budgeted for both wired connections and wireless connections. This way if the wireless connections didn't work that well, the wired connections could always be used. The Council agreed.

Bob then asked for a motion to accept the plan with the minor changes indicated. Moved by Representative Noennig and adopted unanimously.

Bob then went through the FY 02/03 Branch Computer Budget Section by Section and asked if there were any changes. The Council approved moving forward with the 3rd option on the Legislator Automation Spreadsheet which was for 20 Laptops (House 12, Senate 8, and Support Staff 2). There were no changes to the budget as proposed. Bob asked for a motion approving the budget. Moved by Representative Noennig and adopted unanimously.

The Council then moved on to item number 4, on the agenda - Perception that the Capitol building is "Computer Ready". Bob asked Hank to explain this issue. Hank said that he was getting the impression from talking to legislators that the perception was that the Capitol building would be "Computer Ready" for legislators this coming session (2001 Session). Hank said that the perception was that there would either be laptops available for legislators when the got here or that they could bring their own laptops and hook them up. Hank also said that in reality only the wiring infrastructure was in place to provide this service. The pieces that were missing were making the wiring infrastructure hot, any hardware and software needed, support staff and most

of all a budget. Hank said that the staff had been considering a temporary solution to this problem and that was to allow any legislator that brought a laptop or PC (with a modem), to use a phone connection to dial up a local Internet Service Provider. As a result of capitol renovation, every desk in both chambers now has a phone jack. Hank also said that there was very little staff time available (especially at the beginning of session) to help legislators with computer problems. Hank proposed that no staff support be provided. The Council agreed. There followed some discussion about only allowing laptops in the chambers. The Council agreed in concept with the proposal but recognized that several policy decisions needed to be made. These policy decisions as well as whether to continue to move forward with this proposal would require the advice of the new Chief Clerk, Secretary of the Senate and House and Senate Leadership.

Having finished its business for the biennium, the Council adjourned at 4:35 PM..

DRAFT

Information Technology Management Study Final Report

Executive Summary

HB2 Requirements

HB 2, as passed by the 1999 legislature, required an interim study of the governance and management of information technology (IT) in the state. The study was authorized to address legislative concerns regarding state agencies' investments in and expenditures for information technology hardware, software, and services. Language in HB 2 assigned the study to the Legislative Finance Committee (LFC).

HB 2 required four specific outcomes:

recommendations to the Office of Budget and Program Planning (OBPP) for presentation of IT budget information that enables the legislature to make policy decisions relevant to IT budget requests;

development (by OBPP) of a unified computer budget summary by November 15, 2000, showing fiscal year 2000 actual and adjusted IT expenditures and budgeted amounts for each year of the 2003 biennium;

review of the unified computer budget summary and other IT-related budget information by the long-range planning joint appropriations subcommittee, or other legislative committee, as designated, composed of members of the house appropriations and senate finance and claims committees formed specifically to address statewide computer issues; and

a report of committee findings and recommendations to the Governor and the 57th Legislature.

HB 2 authorized the LFC to review and assess Montana's governance, policy, planning, and budgeting structures and processes associated with the state's investment in IT and to recommend appropriate changes and processes that will enable the legislature to make policy decisions relevant to IT budget issues.

The focus of the study was to recommend: 1) the framework for dealing with the IT budget issues during the 2001 legislative session; and 2) a governance structure that enables making future policy decisions that minimize costs, reduce duplication, and maximize efficiencies while providing the greatest possible services to Montana's citizens.

Study Issues

The study dealt with two main issues. First, the LFC faced the issue of how to deal with the Unified Computer Budget Summary during the 2001 legislature. In particular: 1) how to structure the IT budget information for presentation to the 2001 legislature; and 2) how the legislature should review the IT budgets and policy issues in the short-term, during the 2001 legislative session. Second, the LFC faced the issue of how best to structure, for the long-term, how state IT resources are governed to satisfy legislative concerns and intentions.

Recommendations

IT Information in the 2001 Legislative Session

The LFC recommends that a *select subcommittee* made up of members of the House Committee on Appropriations and Senate Finance and Claims Committee be appointed to:

- review the Unified Computer Budget Summary;
- make preliminary policy decisions for dealing with IT budgets from a statewide perspective;
- set internal service rates for the Information Service Division (ISD) of the Department of Administration (DOA); and
- make budget decisions on IT-related budget requests that have been identified by the Legislative Fiscal Division during an analysis of the Unified Computer Budget Summary submitted by OBPP.

IT Governance 2001 and Beyond

The LFC recommends that the following structure be implemented for governing IT:

- The legislature should enact "**legislative guiding principles**" statements to steer the development of IT resources in Montana state government.
- The legislature should create a **Department of Information Technology**, using existing staff in the Information Services Division (ISD) of the Department of Administration (DOA). The director of the department should carry the title and function as the **Chief Information Officer** (CIO) for the state. The CIO and department should be responsible for:
 - developing and maintaining a statewide strategic IT plan;
 - reviewing and approving agency IT plans;
 - establishing statewide policies and standards for IT;

- evaluating IT budget requests;
- coordinating the development of shared IT systems and applications; and
- reporting to the legislature.
- The legislature should create an ***Information Technology Board*** to advise the CIO. The IT board should have its membership and appointing authority included in statute. The IT board should have representatives from all three branches of state government and include representatives for local and federal government and private industry.
- The legislature should accomplish ***oversight of IT*** during the interim with an existing interim standing committee, the Legislative Finance Committee, and during legislative sessions with the Long-Range Planning Subcommittee.
- ***IT related governance statutes should be consolidated*** into one section of law and specific content requirements should be codified for agency and statewide IT strategic plans.

Recommended Statutory Changes

A new section of law dedicated exclusively to information technology governance should be enacted. The section should;

- begin with legislative guiding principles statements;
- create and assign duties of the Department of Information Technology;
- rename and assign members and duties of the Information Technology Board; and
- define the content requirements for agency and statewide IT strategic plans.